

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 19, 2007, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 13 have been amended and claims 2 and 6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to clarify that accepting a user selection further comprises accepting, for analysis, a user designated limited number of related hypertext documents linked to the hypertext document for retrieval, the related hypertext documents comprising the same primary address as the hypertext document, the primary address comprising an internal address associated with the hypertext document and the related hypertext documents, wherein the user selection further comprises accepting, for the analysis, a user designated limited number of link levels, wherein the link levels comprise a first link from the hypertext document to a first one of the related hypertext documents and a second link from the first one of the related hypertext documents to a second one of the related hypertext documents. The claims have further been amended to clarify that the selected criterion involving a name change comprises changing an outdated designation for a company associated with the hypertext document. Support for the claim amendments may be found on page 8, lines 2-4 and on page 13, lines 12-29 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-15, 17-19, and 21-24 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, the pending claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 are rejected as being anticipated by Weinberg et al. (US 6,549,944, hereinafter “Weinberg”). Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of Dutta et al. (US 7,162,526, hereinafter “Dutta”).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-15, 17-19, and 21-24 are rejected as allegedly being indefinite with respect to the claim features “finding offensive material” and “finding copyright violations” recited in claims 1, 5, and 13. The aforementioned claim features have been deleted from the claims without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-15, 17-19, and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 are rejected as being anticipated by Weinberg. Claims 2 and 6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thus rendering the rejection of these claims as moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a computer-executable method of testing a hypertext document for compliance with a selected criterion. The method includes accepting a user selection of the selected criterion and user input of at least one parameter indicative of compliance with the selected criterion for an analysis of the hypertext document, wherein accepting a user selection further comprises accepting, for analysis, a user designated limited number of related hypertext documents linked to the hypertext document for retrieval, the related hypertext documents comprising the same primary address as the hypertext document, the primary address comprising an internal address associated with the hypertext document and the related hypertext documents, wherein the user selection further comprises accepting, for the analysis, a user designated limited number of link levels, wherein the link levels comprise a first link from the hypertext document to a first one of the related hypertext documents and a second link from the first one of the related hypertext documents to a second one of the related hypertext documents; performing the analysis of the hypertext document and generating analysis data, the analysis data comprising an indication of whether the hypertext document is in compliance with the selected criterion; correcting a definable error by presenting the analysis data to an application program; storing the analysis data and the link information for the hypertext document; and presenting at least a portion of the analysis data to the user; wherein the selected criterion involves a name change, the name change comprising changing an outdated designation for a company associated with the hypertext document.

It is respectfully submitted that Weinberg fails to teach or suggest each and every feature specified in amended claim 1. For example, Weinberg fails to teach at least accepting, for analysis, a user designated limited number of related hypertext documents linked to the hypertext document for retrieval, the related hypertext documents comprising the same primary address as the hypertext document, the primary address comprising an internal address associated with the hypertext document and the related hypertext documents, wherein the user selection further comprises accepting, for the analysis, a user designated limited number of link levels, wherein

the link levels comprise a first link from the hypertext document to a first one of the related hypertext documents and a second link from the first one of the related hypertext documents to a second one of the related hypertext documents, as well as failing to teach that the selected criterion involving a name change comprises changing an outdated designation for a company associated with the hypertext document.

Weinberg discusses a test generation tool that automatically generates test scenarios for evaluating the performance of Web sites based on information stored within a server access log of accesses that have been made to a Web site over a period of time. The logs include the IP addresses of visiting users and the URLs that were accessed. The scenario generation process includes using the IP addresses within the log file to “trace” the navigation paths taken by individual users to produce a routes list having information about the number of “hits” occurring on a Web site link. A scanning thread may also be launched on a URL-by-URL basis until all of the URLs for a Web site have been scanned or until the process is halted by a user. The scenario may then be used load-test the Web site. See Col. 3, lines 1-36 and Col. 21, lines 13-32. Weinberg further discusses a “default mode” in which links to external URLs detected during the scanning process are displayed as unverified links and a site manager program (“Astra”) which automatically scans the Web site to create a graphical map showing all of the URLs of the site and the links between these URLs. The site map may be utilized to isolate and repair broken links, focus in on Web pages of a particular content type and/or status, and highlight modifications made to a Web site since a prior mapping. See col. 21, lines 37-59 and col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 2.

Weinberg fails to disclose a user designated limited number of related hypertext documents linked to the hypertext document, which comprise the same primary address as the hypertext document, the primary address comprising an internal address associated with the hypertext document and the related hypertext documents. In contrast, Weinberg is focused on finding external links or URLs to detect unverified links. Thus, Weinberg is not concerned with finding internal addresses associated with a user designated limited number of related hypertext documents. Weinberg also fails to disclose a user designated limited number of link levels, wherein the link levels comprise a first link from the hypertext document to a first one of the related hypertext documents and a second link from the first one of the related hypertext documents to a second one of the related hypertext documents. In contrast, Weinberg discusses

generating a graphical site map of all of the URLs of a Web site (see col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 2) to assist in the identification of broken links, etc. Thus, Weinberg is not concerned with working with a limited number of links as this would detract from the function of the “Astra” site manager program to generate a global site map of links so as to identify and repair broken links, etc. Weinberg further fails to disclose that the selected criterion involves changing a name which comprises changing an outdated designation for a company associated with the hypertext document. In contrast, and as discussed in the Office Action, Weinberg merely discusses a spell checking function for a Web site (see col. 20, lines 9-20). Thus, the spell check functionality of Weinberg would not detect a company name change in an associated hypertext document.

Based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable over Weinberg and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 4, 15, 17-19, 21, and 22 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 5, 9, and 13 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 7-8, 10, 12, and 14 depend from amended claims 5, 9, and 13, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of Dutta. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Weinberg and Dutta fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 23 and 24. Claims 23 and 24 depend from amended claim 1 and thus recite at least the same features. As discussed above, Weinberg fails to teach or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, claims 23 and 24 are allowable over Weinberg for at least the aforementioned reasons.

Dutta, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Weinberg, discusses filtering content (e.g., Web pages), based on the accessibility of the content to a user. An evaluation tool evaluates requested content for accessibility and compares the results to a user required accessibility level to determine if the content is accessible to the user. See Col. 1,

lines 21-62. Dutta however, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest accepting, for analysis, a user designated limited number of related hypertext documents linked to the hypertext document for retrieval, the related hypertext documents comprising the same primary address as the hypertext document, the primary address comprising an internal address associated with the hypertext document and the related hypertext documents, wherein the user selection further comprises accepting, for the analysis, a user designated limited number of link levels, wherein the link levels comprise a first link from the hypertext document to a first one of the related hypertext documents and a second link from the first one of the related hypertext documents to a second one of the related hypertext documents, as well as failing to teach that the selected criterion involving a name change comprises changing an outdated designation for a company associated with the hypertext document.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Weinberg and Dutta fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 23 and 24. Therefore, claims 23 and 24 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: March 19, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE